discussed for 7 years—a pipeline permit, a permit called the Keystone XL Pipeline.

It is not a revolutionary thing. Quite frankly, I wish to show you something. These are all the pipelines that currently exist in the United States.

Right now, there are 19 international crossings of pipelines already coming into the United States, either from Canada into the northern part of the United States or from Mexico and from the South. There are already 19 of them. This would just be a 20th pipeline. There is nothing different about that.

There are 60,000 miles of crude oil pipelines in the United States right now. There are about 63,000 miles of refined product pipelines. If you want to go to natural gas, there are about 300,000 miles of natural gas pipelines already in the United States. Yet this pipeline is treated like some radical and new invention—as if we have never considered a pipeline before. But what surprised me so much wasn't the 2,600-plus days that this pipeline request sat on the President's desk. What surprised me was his reason for actually deciding not to do then the permits. That was the surprising part.

Quite frankly, last Friday afternoon as I heard the reasons, I went back, read the transcript, and these were the three reasons the President gave. He said: No. 1, ''the pipeline wouldn't make a meaningful long-term contribution to our economy,'' and he encouraged us to pass a highway bill instead because it would provide more jobs. I don't remember ever discussing and saying: This pipeline is going to provide as many jobs as highways. That has never been discussed on this floor. It is apples and oranges. A highway bill is public funding. It is the taxpayers that actually fund transportation, and we should do highways in transportation.

This is a private project that was never intended to have as many jobs as a highway. It is a pipeline. So he said it is not going to provide enough jobs, and so he is not going to permit it.

The second reason he gave is this: ''The pipeline would not lower gas prices for American consumers.'' He said gasoline prices are already low, and so we don't need this pipeline—as if gasoline prices don't rise and fall and we shouldn't plan forward for the future.

Do you want to know why gasoline prices are low right now? It is because over the decades, Americans have done this, and we have an efficient system of moving energy. By the way, the pipeline is the safest and least expensive way to move energy around our country. So what the President is saying is this: What we have is enough. I don't want to plan for the future anymore. I don't want to look for what is going to help our children. Our prices are low enough. I don't care what our children pay in the future days.

Well, that is absurd. But, quite frankly, the third one is the one that was the most jarring to me, so I want to be able to say this statement to you. This is reason No. 3 the President gave: ''Shipping crude oil into our country from unstable countries would not increase America's energy security.'' Let me read that to you again because I was so stunned by it. This is exactly from the President's speech off of the White House site. This is what the President said off this statement. He will not permit the Keystone Pipeline coming from Canada into the United States. He said shipping dirtier crude oil into our country would not increase America's energy security. He said:

> What has increased America's energy security is our strategy over the past several years to reduce our reliance on dirty fossil fuels from unstable parts of the world.

Now, as I heard the President say that, I was a little taken aback because I don't remember any other President referring to Canada as an unstable part of the world from which we don't want to get our energy—an unstable country, and saying Canada was that country.

So I kept reading it and rereading it, thinking maybe he was implying something else, but the problem with that is he either means that Canada is an unstable country and we don't want to be reliant on them to get energy or he is saying the Middle East and other countries are unstable and we don't want to rely on them, so maybe we should buy from Canada instead. Either way it makes absolutely no sense.

But in its context—as I read it and read it and read it—the President stated that we don't need to have a Keystone Pipeline because Canada is unstable and we don't want to buy from unstable countries.

I would tell you that since the War of 1812 we have gotten along with Canada pretty well. We seem to have settled our differences about 1815, and they have been a very stable trading partner for us. It seems nonsensical to hear the President say: Because it doesn't produce enough jobs, I am not going to permit it. Because it won't affect the price of gasoline today, I won't permit it. And because Canada is unstable as a trading partner, I am not going to permit it.

The President can choose to do whatever he chooses to do, but answers like this make no sense to the American people and they make no sense to energy country when we understand full well the actual facts on the ground.

In recent days, we have actually started an energy swap with Mexico. Many people may not even know that. You see, all oil is not the same. Heavier crude oil is preferred by many of our refineries in the United States. Quite frankly, our refineries are capable of separating out more of the different minerals and such that are within heavy crude or what is often called sour crude. Our refineries prefer the heavier crude, much like what Canada produces and many parts of the United States and Mexico produces. Many of the refineries in Mexico actually prefer the light sweet crude. We actually have more light sweet crude in America than we can use and what our refineries would prefer to have.

So in the past couple of months, Mexico and the United States have worked a swap from pipelines, where they are picking up about 75,000 barrels of light sweet and swapping us 75,000 barrels of heavier crude because they have a commodity we want and we have a commodity they want. That is how we could solve some of our energy issues, to actually look for what is the most efficient, whether it is purchasing it from a pipeline from Canada, which makes great economic sense to us, or exporting our oil anywhere else around the world, whether to Mexico or any other country.

This body knows full well the United States cannot sell our oil on the world market because we have a statute in place that would have us believe we are running out of oil rather than having a tremendous amount, which is factually true, and we have particular types of oil that like sweet crude many refineries around the world want. We actually have more of it than we can use. We should sell that. We should put that on the open market. It is cleaner, it is easier to refine, and it is a way to be able to stabilize jobs in the United States.

I have been in front of this body time after time with a simple statement: We can sell unleaded around the world, we can sell diesel around the world, we can sell coal around the world, and we can sell natural gas around the world, but for whatever reason we can't sell crude oil around the world. That makes absolutely no sense and we should fix it.

Tens of thousands of Americans have lost their jobs because this body has not acted on something as simple as being able to sell a product the world wants and we have on the world market. It is fixable. It is not about environmental disaster. The world is going to use oil. Even the administration and quite frankly even the President in his own speech made this statement last week: The truth is the United States will continue to rely on oil and gas. And so will the world. Until some other solution is out there, which no one sees currently on the horizon, we are going to continue to use oil and gas. Why don't we do it the cleanest way possible and why don't we provide American jobs while we are doing it?

It is fixable. It shouldn't be divisive. It is about putting Americans back to work and about helping our economy.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Massachusetts.

VETERANS DAY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, tomorrow is Veterans Day, and on Veterans

Day it is important that we thank America's veterans and their families for their service to our Nation. Veterans Day is a time to honor all those brave men and women who put themselves in harm's way so we may enjoy the tremendous freedoms and personal liberties that make our Nation the greatest in the world. Such bravery deserves our unending gratitude.

We have an obligation to honor them all year-round by fighting to ensure they have the resources, the support, and the protections which they have earned. They fought for us, and now we need to fight for them. When we send our men and women in uniform abroad, we can be confident they will do their utmost to complete their missions. Our mission, as Senators, is to minimize the need to send our armed services members into harm's way. The root causes of overseas conflict are complex and diverse, from religious divisions to natural resource allocations, to democratic yearnings. Increasingly, in the modern era, climate change is straining the strands of stability until they snap.

When I was chairman of the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, I held a 2007 hearing where one U.S. general told the story of Somalia, how drought in Somalia had caused a famine and how that famine had ultimately then led to and encouraged a conflict. The pattern in Somalia is the same pattern that we see in other countries: drought leading to famine, leading to fights between different tribes or peoples who otherwise had no reason to fight. Aid came in from the United States, warlords started to fight over it, and that is how 18 U.S. service people lost their lives in what we now call ''Black Hawk Down.''

In 2010, terrible droughts in Russia and China and floods in Pakistan decimated wheat harvests and created a global shortage. The price of wheat increased dramatically. The Middle East, home to the world's top nine wheat importers, felt it severely, especially since the region's farmers struggled with their own parched fields. Much of Syria was gripped with the worst drought it had ever experienced. The price of bread skyrocketed across the region and demands for regime change were not far behind.

As we look around the world, we can see, hear, and feel how climate change is a threat multiplier and a catalyst for conflict today. While we have to deal with the consequences of climate change that are already apparent, there is still time to prevent future catastrophes. That is why President Obama has been using the tool he has in the Clean Air Act to reduce carbon pollution. He has used it to increase the fuel efficiency of America's cars and trucks, and now he has released the Clean Power Plan, but Republicans want to undo it with the Congressional Review Act.

Starting next Monday in this Chamber, Senate Republicans can bring the resolution to the Senate floor at any time to dismantle the Clean Power Plan. Undoing it would be bad for our economy, bad for our health, and bad for our national security.

Now, 2014 was the hottest year in global history. Records go back all the way to 1880—the warmest year. The first half of this year is now the hottest January to June in that same record. The Clean Power Plan captures the scientific urgency and the economic opportunity necessary to avoid the worst consequences of climate change. The Clean Power Plan provides flexibility to the States to find the solutions to reducing carbon pollution that works best for their situations, unleashing a clean energy revolution in every single State in the Union. It will create jobs and save consumers billions on their electricity bills. It will avert almost 100,000 asthma attacks and prevent thousands of premature deaths. The climate and health benefits of the rule are estimated to save $34 billion to $54 billion per year by the year 2030.

Using the Clean Air Act to reduce carbon pollution is grounded in the Supreme Court's 2007 decision that confirmed the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to regulate carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases as pollutants under the Act. The Supreme Court has reaffirmed that authority in two subsequent cases, and we have used that authority to set carbon pollution standards for vehicles. These standards, along with increasing the fuel economy of our Nation's cars and trucks, are reducing pollution, saving drivers money, and sparking innovation. We will see similar benefits coming from the Clean Power Plan.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate say it can't be done. Some will say it will raise electricity bills. Some will say it will kill jobs. The problem for them is their claims are just not true. The Clean Power Plan is a plan to create jobs and to grow our economy. It is a signal to the marketplace to invest in clean energy—in wind, in solar, and other renewable energy resources. That is the 21st century. Too many people on the Senate floor keep looking at the future in a rearview mirror. They keep looking backward instead of ahead, unleashing the technologies of the 21st century. The green generation, the young people in our country, they know we can do this. They know renewables are the technologies of the 21st century. If we do it, it will be a signal to the rest of the world that the United States is going to lead the effort to reduce greenhouse gases, while unleashing a job-creating renewable energy revolution not just for our own country but for the entire planet.

Just 2 months ago, in September, Congress had the honor of hearing from Pope Francis, who shared his message of action. He told us the American people can do it. He said:

I call for a courageous and responsible effort to redirect our steps and to avert the most serious effects of the environmental deterioration caused by human activity. I am convinced we can make a difference and I have no doubt that the United States—and this Congress—have an important role to play. Now is the time for courageous actions and strategies.

He is right. The Pope is right. This is the time for action from Congress—not denial, not obstructionism. Now is the time for the United States, for this Senate, to be the leader in finding the global solutions to this threat of dangerous climate change.

So what the Pope did was take the message of Christ and not deliver a ''Sermon on the Mount,'' he delivered a sermon on the Hill—a sermon on the Hill to the Members of the House and the Senate to do everything they can to reduce dangerous greenhouse gases. In saying that to us, he said it as someone who taught high school chemistry, as someone who knows this issue—a Pope who taught chemistry. The Pope did not believe that science is at odds with religion. The Pope believes science and technology is the answer to our prayers, and he called upon us to unleash a technological revolution to reduce these dangerous greenhouse gases.

Why do we know that we can do this? It is a moral imperative. The Pope basically said three things: No. 1, the planet is dangerously warming and the science confirms that; No. 2, human activity is largely contributing to the warming of the planet and the science confirms that; and, No. 3, since human beings are causing this problem, they have a moral responsibility and a moral imperative to do something about it. We are the United States of America. We are the global leader in technology. We are the revolution. So let's see how far we have come in a very brief period of time.

In 2005, we installed 79 megawatts of solar in the United States. Solar technology had been around for generations. Einstein actually won his Nobel Prize for breakthroughs in solar research. Yet this is where we were in 2005; a tiny 79 megawatts was all we were able to install. Then we began to change policies in the United States. We began to have States across the country, 30 States, which said we are going to have more renewable electricity in our States. We put tax breaks on the books, and look what happened in that very brief period of time. By 2014, nearly 7,000 megawatts in solar were installed in 1 year, up from 79, 100 times more solar, after not doing anything for generations. Policies were put on the books. All the deniers, all those doubters—all of a sudden everything they said about how solar wasn't practical, solar couldn't solve the problem—were confronted with this reality.

This year nearly 8,000 megawatts are going to be installed; next year, 12,000 megawatts of solar. We are going to have 40,000 megawatts of solar installed by the end of next year in the United States—40,000—and we were doing 79

total in 2005. That is how rapidly it is changing. That is how many new jobs are being created in America.

The same thing is happening in wind. Wind is going to be producing 20,000 new megawatts in just 2015 and 2016.

So here is the good news, and it is incredibly great. There will be 300,000 jobs in the wind and solar sector by the end of next year, 300,000 people working. There will only be 65,000 coal miners, but we will have 300,000 people with these incredible jobs in wind and solar. That is a revolution that wasn't on the books just 10 years ago. All the experts said it can't happen, it won't work, and it will never be successful.

So these revolutions are the things on which we have to continue to be the leaders to ensure that we put on the books and keep on the books so that we are successful. There is a technological imperative that we lead, there is an economic imperative that we lead because these jobs get created, and there is a moral responsibility that the United States has because we were the leading polluter for 100 years on the planet. China has now caught up to us, but a lot of that CO_2 is red, white, and blue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. So here is where we are: The President is going to use all of his legal authority to reach a deal in Paris. He will do it pursuant to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change that was signed by President George Herbert Walker Bush and ratified by the Senate in 1992, so everything he is doing in Paris is completely pursuant to a treaty that was agreed to by this body. He is doing the Clean Power Plan to reduce greenhouse gases by 30 percent by the year 2030 in the electric utility sector, by the Clean Air Act of 1990, a law passed by the Senate. He increased the fuel economy standards to 54.5 miles per gallon by the year 2025, still the largest reduction of greenhouse gas in the world's history, pursuant to a law passed in 2007 by the U.S. Senate.

Underlying it all is an authority given to him by the Supreme Court in 2007, in Massachusetts versus the EPA, which mandated the EPA had to act if they found there was an endangerment of an environment. All of this is legal, all of it is authority the President is using, and all of it is working to create a new era of clean energy jobs all across our country so that we are no longer preaching temperance from a barstool to the rest of the world. We can now say to China and to India: You too must put your reductions on the books.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to talk about two issues that are of particular importance to me. When most look at me now, they think about energy and more typically about Alaskan energy. I am not going to disappoint tonight. I would like to speak to that, but I would also like to speak this evening about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the SPR. We have been talking about it a lot of late. It has been viewed as a source of revenue—a pay-for, if you will—with certain measures that we have seen of late, whether it be the transportation measure that we have in front of us, the budget deal that was executed a couple weeks ago, or other measures.

I want to take a few minutes this evening to talk about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. I will start by first addressing what I will call the flagship SPR. It is the very important stuff, if you will, within the Reserve, and that is the crude oil. I call this the flagship because there are five product petroleum reserve sites in the Northeast. We have product reserve sites for gasoline, distillate, and home heating oil, but these are relatively small reserve sites. There are about 2 million barrels total. I think their effectiveness is probably more controversial. But the flagship SPR is truly—when we think about the impact, the import to our economy and to a level of stability, the flagship Strategic Petroleum Reserve occupies giant underground caverns along the gulf coast.

I had the opportunity to visit the site of one of our Strategic Petroleum Reserves. It holds some 695 million barrels, and they are ready to cover our Nation's net imports for several months if global energy markets should spiral out of control.

The comforting reality about these flagship SPRs is that, through thick and thin, these reserves are rarely ever tapped. They have offered a measure of security and stability that I think is unique in the history of global commerce.

Amid higher levels of domestic production and lower levels of imports, a number of reforms are being considered for the SPR by the Department of Energy now. There has been a lot of discussion. There is a study underway by the DOE, and a discussion about upgrading the distribution capacity of the SPR is underway, and it clearly has merit.

The North American energy landscape has changed so quickly and so dramatically that the volume of oil we can pump out of the Reserve is greater and potentially much greater than the volume of oil we can actually move to refineries. This is something we need to understand and study more, but it is something that—we have congested waterways, we can look at reversed pipelines and so on, ways that we can figure out how we can move this oil more readily if we so need it.

In the measure we have just executed with the budget proposal, there is funding set aside for Strategic Petroleum Reserve maintenance and life extension, hopefully for marine terminals, but effectively recognizing that we need to make sure that our SPR actually functions as it is intended. That study is underway. We will learn more, hopefully in the spring, but the imperative to have a functioning, workable SPR is one that goes to national security, really, from an overall stability argument. I remain opposed to suggestions by some that we should use the Reserve to pay for completely unrelated programs or that we simply sell off the entire stockpile, as some have suggested.

As I wrote in my July report of this year called ''A Turbulent World,'' we have drawn down SPR only on a limited number of occasions. In the entire history of the Reserve itself, only approximately 166 million barrels have ever left the storage sites for any reasons. So 166 barrels have been sold off over the course of the life of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for exchanges, emergencies, tests, deficit reductions. Everything that we have ever done that has involved a sale of the SPR totals just about 166 million barrels. That is this graph over here.

Over here are the new proposed sales to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. If we add up the barrels this Congress—the 114th Congress—has already committed to sell for SPR modernization, the Bipartisan Budget Act, the DRIVE Act, the Transportation bill, and then a bill over on the House side, the 21st Century Cures Act, we are looking at a total of 279 million barrels to be sold off. That is 40 million for SPR modernization, 58 million for the Bipartisan Budget Act, 21st Century Cures Act is 80 million, and the highway bill is 101 million. We would be selling off 279 million barrels total. Think about that—in the entire life of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, 166 million barrels sold off. In one Congress, what we are proposing is 279 million barrels. It is quite eye-catching.

These numbers matter. The SPR is designed to provide 90 days of net import protection. It is a pretty simple math equation we are dealing with. If we import more, we need more in storage; if we import less, we need less. Currently, net imports are about 5 million barrels per day. Therefore, the bare minimum we need in storage is 450 million barrels. So if we execute all of the sales the 114th Congress has either approved or is considering, we dip below the bare minimum that is required—the 450 million barrels—by the end of the 10-year window. I am going to be releasing another report on the cumulative impact of all these sales on the integrity of the Reserve, so we should be seeing that in a few days.

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR DEFENSE DISTRICT 5

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Now, Mr. President, I would like to turn quickly to a Department of Energy proposal to construct a new petroleum product reserve